

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2001

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/673,614	10/19/2000	Jean-Francois Grimaldi	Q61365	Q61365 2115	
75	90 12/12/2001	•			
Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW			EXAMINER		
			NGUYEN, PHUONGCHI T		
Washington, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2833		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/673,614	GRIMALDI ET AL.	
Theresory Tremon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuongchi T Nguyen	2833	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspond	lence address	
THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	abandonment of this application. timely filed amendment which place	A proper reply to a ces the application in	· d
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing dat FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	e of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exte fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sl (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office la filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	nsion and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply originall tter than three months after the mailing date	fee. The appropriate extension of the final Office acts of the final rejection, even	ension etion; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because	se:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further of	consideration and/or search (see NO	OTE below);	• •
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below	w);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in be issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	etter form for appeal by materially	reducing or simplify	ing the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	a corresponding number of finally	rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	u(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a sepa	arate, timely filed am	nendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See <u>Co</u>		ed but does NOT place	ce the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becauraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	se it is not directed SOLELY to iss	sues which were new	rly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a explanation of how the new or amended claims would	) will not be entered or b) be rejected is provided below or a	will be entered a appended. ( see cor	ind an otricuation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examin	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	•
10. Other:		Woda	Z

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In responding to applicant 's argument, on page 4, based on Applicant 's analysis of Appendix B and the statement on line 9, "As shown, each of the intersection points is outside of the base 66" is not deem prsuasive. If looking back on the Applicant 's present invention of fig.2, "the two branch (11, 12) lie in two diverging planes (11.1, 12.1 or the portion of 18, 12 (since 18 is parallel to 11.1)) and intersection of the two planes (at 19) is also outside within the base (13) of the U-shape.